

### **Remarks**

The present communication addresses all of the rejections set forth in the remarks.

#### Claim Rejection 35 USC §112, Items 3-5 of Action

Applicant has amended the claims to address the 112 rejections. The §112 rejections should be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejection 35 USC §103

The application rejects claims 36-40, 42, 43 and 50 as being unpatentable over Howarth 3,481,79 and Doncaster EP 0940680 A2. The action further rejects claims 41 and 44 as being unpatentable over Howarth and Doncaster in further view of Otani (see related U.S. 7,479,255). Also the action rejects claims 45-49 as being unpatentable over Doncaster in view of Howarth and Daeche WO 00/00820.

Applicant has amended claims 36 and 45 to clarify their allowability over the cited references. Claim 36, as clarified, concerns a base having a floor and a metal lead frame molded into a base and parallel to said floor. Also, the claim concerns a sensor displaced in a vertical direction with the contacts of the metal frame perpendicular to the vertical direction. The cited references do not have or make the above features obvious. Howarth and Doncaster were cited against claim 36. The action identifies lead lines 37 and 39 as disclosing applicant's metal frame. The lead lines run perpendicular to the floor of the Howarth housing and parallel to the vertical direction of displacement of the sensor. The action identifies terminals 6 and 7 of Doncaster as the metal frame. These terminals run perpendicular to the floor of Doncaster and parallel to the vertical direction of displacement. None of the other cited references have the above feature. Accordingly, claim 36 and those that depend from 36 are allowable.

Applicant has amended claim 45 so that it concerns a conducting lead frame having first second and third lines which are parallel with the housing's cavity floor. None of the cited references have the above feature. The action cited Doncaster, Howarth and Daeche as demonstrating the obviousness of claim 45. For the reasons stated above neither Doncaster or Howarth have the features of claim 45. Daeche does not make up for the shortcomings of these references. Accordingly, claim 45 and those that depend from claim 45 are allowable. A Notice of Allowance should now issue.

Respectfully submitted,

**HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP  
WELSH & KATZ**

March 26, 2010

By: 

James B. Conte  
Reg. No. 54,661  
Attorney for Applicant

120 South Riverside Plaza  
Floor 22  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 655-1500